

FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM OF ISRAEL

DAILY PRESS BULLETIN

No. 15

Tel Aviv, 2nd August, 1948

---

1) TO GOD AND TO BAAL.

("Mivrak", 2.8.48.)

The Government of Israel has succeeded for the time being to satisfy everybody.

It gave some satisfaction to the popular demand to ensure the Jewish character of Jerusalem. At the same time the Swedish count was given to understand that Mr. Shertok would not object to the demilitarization of Jerusalem, nor to the establishment of an international administration there. Bernadotte sent a report to that effect to the Security Council.

The choice of military governor exhibits the same tendency - to serve simultaneously God and Baal.

Dr. Joseph, chosen for the post, has little qualification for governorship and even less for military authority. This Mapai nominee has a reputation for his readiness to yield. Those who take interest in his person will probably remember how far he had gone in his readiness to make concessions during his detention in Latrun.

This military governor by Mapai's grace is considered by the Jewish Jerusalem as a stranger. His main qualification is his fluent English and, it seems, this qualification has decided his appointment. Apparently Mr. Joseph's duties will necessitate little contact with the Government of Israel; he will be busy mostly with negotiations with U.N.O. representatives and foreign consuls. In other words the main concern of the military governor will be not to pave way for the inclusion of Jerusalem in the Jewish State, but to place it under the protection of the Cross.

For the time being the Government has succeeded in appeasing the public opinion, without giving Bernadotte a cause for dis-appointment. But the system is bound to fail in the long run. It is impossible to sit between chairs, especially in matters concerning religion and politics. If the Government has no fear of the appearance of a modern prophet to denounce it, then the stern reality will nevertheless press for a clear and unequivocal answer.

- 2 -

The transient situation in the capital cannot last. The military governor is but a temporary authority. In a few weeks the Government of Israel will have to show its cards and to make a decision. If it turns to God, then Jerusalem will be the capital of the State of Israel, if to Baal - then Baal's priests will rule in the City of David.

The transient situation cannot last. The people of Jerusalem will not rest, nor will Bevin's agents. The pressure will increase from both directions. If the Government has no desire to be crushed by this double pressure, if it wishes to take up the initiative and not to straggle behind the events, then it must make up its mind before it is too late.

We would advise it to choose the God of Jerusalem and abandon the Baal of Internationalization.

2) INTRODUCING - THE NEW OCCUPANT. ("Mivrak", 30.16.48.)

If thirty years ago anyone had dared to brand the British administration in Palestine, whether military or civilian, with the name of occupant, he would have been called...

No, the conjecture is too wild. Nobody could have thought at the time of the word "occupant", least of all a Jew. That was the time of the Anglo-Jewish honeymoon. Lovers' eyes are misty during a honeymoon. Even if Britain had claimed for herself a different status, e.g. wanted Palestine as a dominion or a colony, even then the Jews, intoxicated by the Balfour declaration, would not have used the word, moreover as such a well-sounding term as "mandate" had been found.

What is the object of this discourse? The argument seems to be pointless and superfluous. There is very little respect left for the term "mandate" and even less for its British holder. There could be an argument on the question whether a treachery was committed or, the original intention having been just to gain rule, the term treachery is inapplicable and the Zionist simple-mindedness is to be blamed for the misunderstanding.

But it is far from our intention to discuss the trite and the well known. The object of this historical reminiscence is to help us in introducing the new occupant, the United States. The object of the foreword is to remind us not to be dazzled by external appearance, nor to be lured by sweet sounds.

At a first glance everything seems to be in order. Instead of a National Home we have the State of Israel, instead of the mandate - the U. N. decision, the Observation Committee taking naturally the place of the Mandatory Power. Everything fits nicely. The independence is well formulated and the occupation well camouflaged.

But taught by bitter experience, instructed by the international situation, cured of our former simplicity and detesting all subterfuge, we permit ourselves to fling this term into our political atmosphere and to declare publicly: we are now witnessing a new occupation of Eretz-Israel. A partition will probably be effected. Not the partition decided upon by the U.N.O., but a different one - the partition of Eretz-Israel into a British and an American zone. Having no forces available for a direct rule, Britain will rule her zone through the medium of Abdullah. U. S. will rule its zone by means of that new and dynamic imperialist force - the dollar. It will be supported by U. S. navy's friendly calls at the ports of the State of Israel, while there will be a hot competition between Mr. Shertok and Rabbi Silver in making the greatest number of calls at the White House.

With regard to Jerusalem, a direct occupation is envisaged. It will be a mandate under the cover of international administration. Bernadotte's proposal to give Jerusalem to Abdullah was a slick trick, certainly not made in Sweden. Sweden is famous for its fine steel, but it is often tempered and polished by non-Swedish hands. The aim of the trick was double: to bolster up the sagging Arab morale and make the Jews to regard the internationalization of Jerusalem as their only salvation.

Three hundred observers and about three thousand soldiers are not sent merely to supervise a truce. If the parties concerned do not want the truce, these hundreds and thousands will be insufficient in order to enforce it; if they accept the truce, then all these soldiers and observers are unnecessary. The truth is that they have come here to achieve occupation, directly or indirectly. This is the real reason why Mr. Joseph's prestige, somewhat damaged of late, has risen again. What is needed is a man who combines a good command of English with a flexible spine. The declaration of Jerusalem as a Jewish occupied territory should deceive nobody. The declaration is only a vanguard of the coming occupation. The main task of vanguard is to remove obstacles. The obstacle in this case is familiar; it is the same obstacle that wrecked the realization of the Morrison Scheme; too weak to gain a victory, it is, nevertheless, strong enough to prevent surrender.

Although speaking with conviction, we would not like our analysis to be accepted as an infallible prophecy. We are not trying to foretell the future course of events; nor do we regard the occupation as inescapable. Our defeatists used to cling to their familiar argument: the British must rule here, since the area is of vital importance to them; they will bring the full weight of their pressure to bear on us, so what chance we have?

The same defeatism is now whispering again: if Americans make up their mind to gain control over Eretz-Israel, what chance we have against them? It would be more sensible to seek a compromise... Approved For Release 2006/11/13 : CIA-RDP83-00415R001300020005-9

Our reply to the defeatist arguments is exactly the same as in the past. Neither troops nor armour are decisive. There are other factors besides. The factor that decided the British defeat was the natural British aversion to sustaining casualties. Americans have their weak points too. The public opinion of the United States is still largely anti-imperialist. The average American still cannot understand why the occupation of a country like Palestine is necessary. As to the French soldier it is quite easy to find a way to approach him, either from the left or from the right, and make him refuse to be cannon-fodder for the sake of the Anglo-American imperialism.

Therefore the Fighters for Freedom are not losing heart. They leave despair to the defeatists, adaptability to the Palestine Communists and a correct but barren of action political diagnosis to the Mapam.

The Fighters will remain unchanged, i.e. they will fight for the liberty of the Homeland against all foreign occupants.